

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 12-25 remain in the application. Claims 12-25 are subject to examination. Claims 12 and 21 have been amended.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 12-25 have been rejected as being obvious over Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0112870 A1 to Kobayashi et al. in view of European Patent application EP 0 854 666 A2 to Lochbrunner et al. and further in view of Published U.S. Patent Application 2001/0017766 to Murowaki et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully believe that the Examiner has failed to adequately support the rejection and this is discussed below.

With regard to the teaching in Kobayashi et al., the Examiner has alleged that the liquid sealing material 9 is a heat conducting adhesive layer and that the liquid sealing material 9 connects the edge of the printed circuit board 2 to the top of the surface of the element identified by reference numeral 57. In the response to arguments section, the Examiner has remarked that the top of the support posts of Kobayashi et al. are identified by reference numeral 57.

Applicants first respectfully point out that the Examiner is incorrect in asserting that the liquid sealing material 9 connects the edge of the printed circuit board 2 to a surface. Applicants also respectfully point out that the reference numeral 57 does not identify the top of the support posts 52.

The liquid sealing material 9 of Kobayashi et al. does not connect the edge region of the printed circuit board 2 to any part of the casing body 5 or of the casing 8. Fig. 6, which has been referenced by the Examiner, clearly shows that the liquid sealing material 9 is placed in the groove portion 59 that is formed in the flange portion 58 (also see paragraph 44). This liquid sealing material 9 is used to seal the ridge portion 84 of the cover 8 to the groove portion 59 of the flange portion 58 of the casing body 5 (see paragraph 57). In other words, the sealing material seals the cover 8 to the casing body 5. Fig. 6 also clearly shows that the edge of the printed circuit board 2 ends without ever reaching the groove portion 59. This, of course, must be the case since otherwise there would not be room for the ridge portion 84 of the cover 8 to fit into the groove portion 59.

Additionally, applicants point out that reference numeral 57 does not identify the top of the posts 52, but rather identifies two rear edge portions of the casing body 5. The flange portion 58 extends from the edge portion 57 (See Fig. 1 and paragraph 44). Note that the edge portion 57 is located on the outside of the groove portion 59, and that the printed circuit board 2 does not extend as far as the groove portion 59.

Applicants respectfully believe that the Examiner has failed to adequately support the rejection. Applicants therefore request withdrawal of the final rejection and entry of the amendments to claims 12 and 23, which have been amended to even better define the invention.

Support for the changes can be found by referring to Figs. 1 and 2, which show that the raised second surface 32 and the first surface 30 are on opposite sides of the surface extending between them.

Claims 12 and 21 now specify that the first surface extends in a first direction from the continuous wall, the raised second surface extends in a second direction from the continuous wall, and the second direction is opposite the first direction. Claims 12 and 21 also specify that the printed circuit board is on the raised second surface of the housing floor.

Kobayashi et al. clearly teach that the printed circuit board 2 is mounted on the support posts 52 as can be seen in Fig. 6. The top of these support posts 52 and the floor of the casing 5 both extend away from the side wall portions 53, 54 in the same direction. In other words, both the support posts 52 and the floor of the housing extend toward the inside from a respective side wall portion 53, 54.

The configuration of Kobayashi et al. does not meet the limitations of claims 12 and 21 that have been copied above. Therefore, even if Murowaki et al. did suggest using a heat conductive adhesive layer, and even if Lochbrunner et al. did suggest placing electronic components on both sides of a printed circuit board, the invention as defined by claims 12 and 21 would not have been obtained.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 12 or 21. Claims 12 and 21 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 12 or 21.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 12-26 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 10/566,698
Reply to Office Action of March 16, 2009
Amdt. Dated May 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

May 15, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101